



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and there exist likewise two unintelligent Latin versions which were probably made from the Arabic. Of the Arabic version and of the Arabic version of a pseudo-Galenian commentary on it, of which Harder had given extracts, an edition and complete German translation are announced for early publication by Dr. G. Bergsträsser. Dr. Roscher has seen and utilized a typewritten copy of the latter, from which he publishes extracts in addition to the other lines of tradition above mentioned. Dr. Roscher likewise offers in the volume here noticed a sketch of the history of the treatise *Περὶ ἐβδομάδων*, a number of more or less parallel texts relating to the number seven drawn from other ancient sources, and several appendices in which he deals with the review of his views by Dr. Lortzing and with the points raised by Professor F. Boll, *Die Lebensalter*, Leipzig, 1913. An analytical table of contents and full indexes complete the volume.

No one will question the value of Dr. Roscher's work, though it cannot be said that he has made good his main point. It is altogether likely that the treatise is pre-Hippocratic, dating from the middle or second quarter of the fifth century B.C., at least in its earlier chapters; but it is unlikely that it dates from the sixth century. The striking similarity to certain parts of *Περὶ διαίτης* is a factor of considerable importance of which Dr. Roscher has taken no account. The subject is, however, too large to be discussed here.

A great deal still remains to be done before the text of the first Greek fragment can be read and understood. Perhaps it is best to await the appearance of Dr. Bergsträsser's work before attempting further emendation. Professor Boll anticipated some corrections in chaps. i and ii which I had noted; in c. 3 *ἄμα πνέουσιν, ἀπνευματί*, and *ἀνὰ πνεύμασιν* are clearly corrupt, and the versions suggest *ἀνάπνευσι, ἀμπνεύματι*, and *ἀνάπνευσιν*.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

De Ovidii Heroidum Codice Gissensi. Dissertatio quam scripsit HENRICUS ROESE. *Gissae*, 1913.

In Ovid's second *Heroid*, Phyllis addressing the faithless Demophoon says (vss. 17-20):

Saepe deos supplex ut tu scelerate valeres
Sum prece turicremis devenerata focis.
Saepe videns ventos caelo pelagoque faventes
Ipsa mihi dixi, "si valet, ille venit."

So the Vulgate text reads, with approval from various recent scholars—Sedlmayer, Peters, Housman, Purser—despite the fact that vss. 18 and 19 are found in only a few of the manuscripts mentioned in early editions and in only one of the manuscripts known today, a Giessen codex (*Bibl. Acad.*, LXVI) of the fourteenth century. The lines are necessary for the

sense, are good in themselves, and could readily be omitted from one or more sources by the familiar error due to *homoioteleuta*. Their text as given in the Gissensis contains errors which indicate something of a history behind it. *Turmoniis* is a corruption removed more than one stage from *turicremis*. *Cum* for *sum* and *sum venerata* for *devenerata* are also errors. Ovid is rather fond of putting *sum*, whether or not in a compound tense, at the beginning of the line; cf. *Her.* 13.18: *Sumque tuos oculos usque secuta meis*, a line built on much the same model as this one. So in that most Ovidian letter, the genuineness of which is doubted by some (*Her.* 21.122): *Sumque parum prudens capta puella dolis*. *Devenerari* occurs nowhere else in Ovid, but it is a metrically convenient word which he would not scorn, as Tibullus has it. With *veneror* Ovid uses the ablative without *cum*; cf. *Met.* 6.314–15. *Cum prece* is intelligible, but the preposition at the beginning of the verse receives a rather ridiculous emphasis. If the Gissensis is guilty of such alterations, we can perhaps call it wrong also in substituting *secundos* for *faves* in vs. 19, even if fair winds in Ovid are generally *secundi* and only once (*Met.* 15.49) *faves*. These mistakes, then, presuppose the existence of one or more ancestors of the Gissensis of at least as early a date as the fourteenth century.

In a summary of his doctoral dissertation¹ Dr. W. H. Freeman makes clear that the oldest manuscripts of the *Heroides*, headed by Paris 8242 S. IX, depend upon a common source (x^6) which did not contain *Her.* 16.39–144 or 21.144–248. These passages had been lost from the archetype (x) of all our codices at the time when x^6 was copied. x was a manuscript of twenty-six lines to the page, whereas x^6 had twenty-two. The latter had lost still other passages, *Her.* 15 (110 verses) and 21.13–144 when x^7 was copied from it. From x^7 descends the codex used by Maximus Planudes, the Guelferbytanus, the Etonensis, and others. The existence of all these passages in manuscripts of the fifteenth century—and they are all genuine for one who is not *prorsus ab Ovidio alienus*—shows that these codices, despite their peculiar corruptions, depend on some copy of x which, unlike x^6 , was made before the parent manuscript had lost these portions of the *Heroides*. Our hope is to find among the late manuscripts some comparatively uncorrupted descendant of such a codex. But such has not yet been found.

The Gissensis at once arouses expectation on account of *Her.* 2.18–19. Sedlmayer in his *Prolegomena* (1878) had therefore given the manuscript a high rank, but he depended upon a faulty collation made by Wigand. Peters (*Observationes*, etc., 1882) studied the book with care and pronounced it infected with the same recension that appears in the Etonensis and the Guelferbytanus. There is no reason for doubting Peters' statements, but as no full report of the Gissensis has yet been made, the present dissertation has a purpose. The author gives an apparently complete collation, from

¹ *Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.*, XII (1912), 168 ff.

which Peters' judgment may be amply confirmed. Since the text does not contain *Her.* 15, or 16.39-144 or 21.31-248, it obviously depends upon α^7 , as its corrupt readings also show. Herr Roese accepts *Her.* 2.18-19 as genuine—he wrongly prefers the textual variants given by the Gissensis—and naturally concludes that the verses were added in some ancestor of the Gissensis from another source. That is the very source that we were seeking, and have still to seek. As was apparent from the data given by Peters, the text of the Giessen manuscript is conflate and corrupt.

A matter much needing investigation is the part played in transforming the text of Ovid's *Carmina amatoria*, by a set of scholia and glosses written, it would seem, in the ninth century. No manuscript gives such a commentary entire, but traces of it appear in the Oxoniensis of the *Ars amatoria*, the Sangallensis of the *Amores* and in various manuscripts of the *Heroides*. If the notes "*quibus codex (Gissensis) large instructus est*" belong to this early commentary and not to some late affair, they deserve more attention than is given them in this dissertation. We should have been more interested in a selection of important specimens than in the author's comments on the nature of mediaeval glosses in general or in the information that he found it difficult to read the marginalia even with a glass and that he derived great help from Capelli's (otherwise not very satisfactory) lexicon of abbreviations.

On the whole, this is a slim performance. The writer expresses grief (*valde doleo*) that he could find out nothing about the *bibliotheca Menteliana* to which the Giessen book formerly belonged. Had he consulted Heinsius' *Virgil* and Töcker's *Allgemeines Gelehrtenlexikon*, this grief might have been easily assuaged. Herr Roese's Latin though understandable is not elegant: it descends to a schoolboy's *Formenlehre* in: *Attamen mihi contacturum esse, ut res obscuras explanem, sperare non desisto* and becomes fairly desperate in: *pro genuitate horum versuum pugnavit*. Of the sixty-three pages of this work, five form the introduction, five discuss *Her.* 2.18-19, and the rest, except the brief summary at the end, are devoted to the description of the codex and to the collation, which includes occasional remarks, of not much pith, on the proper readings. The whole makes a respectable *Gymnasialprogram*, but is hardly a dissertation.

E. K. RAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Das Motiv der Mantik im antiken Drama. By RUDOLF STAHLIN.
Giessen: Töpelmann, 1912. Pp. 230. M. 7.20.

This work is divided into six chapters corresponding to the seven Greek and Roman playwrights whose plays are extant, Plautus and Terence being considered together. The fragments of Menander happen to exhibit no instance of *μαντική* (p. 187). The first chapter, dealing with Aeschylus, appeared in 1911 as a Heidelberg dissertation. Inasmuch as Emile Thomas